

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
3

4 Ervin Middleton,  
5 Plaintiff

2:16-cv-01369-JAD-GWF

6 v.

**Order Dismissing Action**

7 Omely Telecom Corp. aka Pro Tax &  
8 Accounting,  
9 Defendant

10  
11 After two years and several orders, this is a single-count Telephone Consumer Protection  
12 Act<sup>1</sup> case in which service still has not been effected on the lone defendant. In July 2018, I gave  
13 plaintiff Ervin Middleton one final opportunity to properly serve defendant Omely Telecom  
14 Corp. with the original complaint and a newly issued summons.<sup>2</sup> I had the Clerk of Court send  
15 Middleton the USM-285 form to fill out and provide to the U.S. Marshal's office so that service  
16 could be effected. And I explicitly warned—in bold—that **“If Omely Telecom Corp. is not**  
17 **properly served with the original complaint and the new summons by September 25, 2018,**  
18 **this case will be dismissed under FRCP 4(m) without further prior notice.”**<sup>3</sup> But Middleton  
19 did not provide the U.S. Marshal with a completed USM-285 form, and service still has not been  
20 effected on Omely.<sup>4</sup>

21 FRCP 4(m) requires service of the summons and complaint to be completed within 90  
22 days of the complaint's filing, and “[i]f a defendant is not served within 90 days after the  
23

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>1</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

26 <sup>2</sup> ECF No. 42.

27 <sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 6.

28 <sup>4</sup> *See* ECF No. 44.

1 complaint is filed, the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss  
2 the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a  
3 specified time.”<sup>5</sup> Rule 4(c)(1) further makes it clear that “[t]he plaintiff is responsible for having  
4 the summons and complaint served within the time allowed under Rule 4(m).”<sup>6</sup>

5 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of  
6 that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.<sup>7</sup> A  
7 court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a  
8 court order, or failure to comply with local rules.<sup>8</sup> In determining whether to dismiss an action  
9 on one of these grounds, the court must consider: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious  
10 resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the  
11 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the  
12 availability of less drastic alternatives.<sup>9</sup>

13 The first two factors, the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the  
14 court’s interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of the plaintiff’s claims. The  
15 third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a  
16 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading  
17

---

18  
19 <sup>5</sup> Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

20 <sup>6</sup> Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c).

21 <sup>7</sup> *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).


22 <sup>8</sup> See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with  
23 local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to  
24 comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439,  
25 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs  
26 to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir.  
1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,  
1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

27 <sup>9</sup> *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130; *Ferdik*,  
28 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

1 ordered by the court or prosecuting an action.<sup>10</sup> A court’s warning to a party that its failure to  
2 obey the court’s order will result in dismissal satisfies the fifth factor’s “consideration of  
3 alternatives” requirement.<sup>11</sup> And that warning was given here.<sup>12</sup> The fourth factor—the public  
4 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors  
5 favoring dismissal.

6 Accordingly, because service was not effectuated within the time required by Rule 4(m)  
7 and the generous extension of that time period that the court granted in July 2018,<sup>13</sup> IT IS  
8 HEREBY ORDERED that **this action is DISMISSED** without prejudice under FRCP 4(m), and  
9 **the Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS**  
10 **CASE.**

11 DATED: January 3, 2019.

12  
13   
14 U.S. District Judge Jennifer Dorsey  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

---

24 <sup>10</sup> See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

25 <sup>11</sup> *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

26 <sup>12</sup> ECF No. 42.

27 <sup>13</sup> See *id.* at 2.